

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 2 are withdrawn from consideration as being elected to a non-elected group of claims. By this Amendment, claims 3, 9 and 16 are amended. No new matter is added by these amendment. Support for the above amendments can be found at least in paragraph [0021] of the Applicants disclosure. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, in paragraph 1, objects to claim 16 for informalities. Claim 16 has been amended to obviate the objection. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection of claims 16 for informalities is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, in paragraph 2, rejects claims 3-6 and 9-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,498,297 to O'Neil. Claims 3-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,210,462 to Tourneux. Additionally, claims 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tourneux in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,453,391 to Haynos. The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

With respect to pending claim 3, the Office Action asserts that O'Neil and Tourneux individually teach all of the features as recited in the pending claims. This assertion is incorrect. Specifically, neither reference teaches an upper surface thereof receiving light is exposed, as positively recited in amended claim 3. Specifically, O'Neil teaches, as illustrated in Fig. 4, that the solar cell package 6 is covered by an upper transparent dielectric film. Further, Tourneux teaches, as illustrated in Fig. 1, that the solar cell 6 is covered by an adhesive 19. Therefore, neither reference can reasonably be considered to teach all of the features as positively recited in amended claim 3.

With respect to claim 16, the Office Action asserts that some permissible combination of Tourneux and Haynos teach the features as positively recited in the amended claim. For at least the reasons as discussed above, and the amendment of claim 16 to depend from allowable claim 3, this assertion is incorrect. Additionally, one skilled in the art would not look to the reference of Tourneux to address the problems confronting the Applicants. Specifically, the subject matter of the pending claims recites an upper surface thereof receiving light is exposed, as positively recited in amended claim 3, from which amended claim 16 now depends, while Haynos teaches a mesh-like connector 16, as illustrated by Figs. 1 and 2, with the adhesive of Tourneux. Neither reference providing an upper surface that is exposed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action fails to assert a *prima facie* case of anticipation and/or obviousness, with the applied prior art references, for at least their failure to show the features as discussed above.

For at least the above reasons, neither O'Neil, Tourneux or Haynos can reasonably be considered to teach, or even to have suggested, the combinations of all of the features recited in at least independent claim 3. Further, claims 4-20 are also neither taught, nor would they have been suggested, by the applied prior art references for at least the respective dependence of these claims on allowable independent claim 3, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the subject matter of claims 3-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) & §103(a) as being anticipated by the applied prior art references are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-20 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kirk D. Berkhimer
Registration No. 59,874

JAO:KDB

Date: June 29, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
